

**R E P O R T**  
**OF**  
**The Bhadrachalam Boat Tragedy**  
**Enquiry Committee**

सत्यमेव जयते

## THE BHADRACHALAM BOAT TRAGEDY ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

---

On the 10th April, 1957 between 8 and 9 a.m. two boats carrying a large number of pilgrims across the river Godavari from Bhadrachalam to Borgampad capsized in midstream and according to official figures 203 were drowned. This calamity on such unprecedented scale greatly agitated the public mind and the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri N. Sanjeeva Reddy, announced in the Legislative Assembly on 17th April, 1957 the appointment of a committee to inquire into this and report to Government. The following G.O. No. 639, (G.A. Dept.) dated 18th April, 1957 was accordingly issued :

“The Government of Andhra Pradesh hereby order the constitution of a Committee consisting of the following Members to investigate the causes of the boat tragedy at Bhadrachalam on the 10th April, 1957 and to suggest means and methods of preventing a recurrence of similar accidents. The Chairman may in consultation with other members decide the line of action for the Committee :

Shri R. B. Ramakrishna Raju, M.L.A.

Shri N. Narotham Reddy, M.P.

Shri Gulam Hyder, I.A.S., 5th Member, Board of Revenue.

Shri A. K. Kunhiram Nambiar, I.P.S., Inspector-General of Police.

Shri L. Venkata Krishna Iyyer, Consulting Chief Engineer, Andhra Pradesh.

The Committee is requested to submit its report to Government as quickly as possible preferably in a fortnight. Shri R. B. Ramakrishna Raju, M.L.A., will be the Chairman of the Committee ”

The General Administration Department through D.O. No. 1143/57-18, dated 7th May, 1957 appointed Shri K. G. Desikan, Assistant Secretary, Board of Revenue as Secretary to the Committee.

2. On the 17th of April, 1957 when the appointment of the Committee was announced in the Legislative Assembly, the Chairman was not present as he had left for Chittoor the previous day. On the 19th April, 1957 the Chief Secretary informed him by wire of the appointment of the Committee and asked him to go over to Hyderabad immediately. The Chairman, therefore, left Chittoor on the 20th and reached Hyderabad on the 21st morning. Soon after he contacted the other Members of the Committee, discussed the line of action to be pursued and various matters connected with the enquiry and requested Mr. L. Venkata Krishna Iyyer, one of the Members of the Committee who was in Madras to go over immediately. He reached Hyderabad on the 25th morning and in the same evening the Committee left for Bhadrachalam. On the 26th April, 1957 morning the Committee crossed over to Bhadrachalam. The enquiry commenced in the Office of the Revenue Divisional Officer at 2-30 p.m. 22 Witnesses were examined and their statements recorded on that day.

3. On the following day 27th April, 1957, the Committee inspected the two boats involved in the accident. Their notes of inspection is marked as Exhibit No. A. 30. Thereafter the Committee proceeded to Dummugudam to inspect the Anicut, as well as the sluices therein and the locks. In the afternoon, 21 persons were examined at Bhadrachalam. The next day the Committee met at 8 a.m. and eleven (11) more persons were examined and all the persons who offered to give evidence were examined and the enquiry closed at Bhadrachalam. In the evening the Committee left Bhadrachalam and reached Kothagudum at 7 p.m., where five (5) more witnesses were examined.

4. From the list of dead persons produced before the Committee, they found that many of them came from the various districts of Andhra Pradesh and so they thought it was desirable that a notice should be published in the press inviting those who wished to give evidence to communicate with the Committee. The following notice was, therefore, issued and it was published in all newspapers in English and Telugu :

“The Committee requests those who can give useful information relating to the capsizing of two boats resulting in great loss of life on Godavari River near Bhadrachalam on 10th April, 1957 will be good enough to communicate their information and knowledge by a signed

written statement to Shri Gulam Hyder, I.A.S., a Member of the Committee at Hyderabad on or before the 12th May, 1957 and state if they are willing to appear before the Committee and give evidence ”

The Committee met again at Hyderabad on 6th May, 1957 and decided to take evidence on 21st and 22nd May, 1957 and meet again if necessary on 27th and 28th May, 1957.

In response to the above notice 42 written representations were received out of which the Committee summoned twenty persons to appear on the 21st and 22nd May, 1957 at Hyderabad in the Office of the Board of Revenue. The invitess were also informed that a reasonable travelling allowance and bhatta will also be paid to them. The Committee also requested the appearance of four officials for eliciting further information, namely : The Revenue Divisional Officer, Bhadrachalam, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bhadrachalam and Superintending Engineer, Dhowleshwaram Circle, and the Temple Amin, Bhadrachalam.

5. The Committee met again on the 21st May, 1957 which was declared a holiday by the Government due to the demise of Andhra Kesari Sri Tanguturi Prakasam Pantulu Garu. The Committee also passed a resolution paying homage to the departed leader but could not adjourn the enquiry as the witnesses had come and were anxious to leave as soon as possible. The Committee, therefore, met at 10-30 a.m. but Sri A. K. Kunhiram Nanbiar and Sri N. Narotham Reddy could not be present as they were busy with arrangements for the State Funeral of Sri Tanguturi Prakasam Pantulu. On the 22nd all the Five Members were present. On 21st and 22nd May, 1957, 18 more witnesses and the four official witnesses who were already examined at Bhadrachalam, were examined. In all the Committee had examined 77 witnesses and their names are mentioned seriatim in Appendix I attached hereto.

6. The enquiry was also open to the public and the press and was well attended. The two local M.L.As Srimati Vani Ramana Rao and Sri Mohd. Tahsil were informed in advance of the Committee's meeting at Bhadrachalam and they were present during the enquiry there. They were also informed about the enquiry on the 21st and 22nd May, 1957 at

Hyderabad but they were not present. The 77 witnesses examined fall under the following categories :—

1.	<i>Survivors</i> .. .. .	16
	(i.e. persons who were actually in the two boats at the time of occurrence and managed to escape—Witness Nos : 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 26, 30, 34, 37, 60, 62, 64, 66, 67 and 75).	
2.	<i>Eye-Witnesses to the occurrence</i> .. .. .	23
	(a) Non-officials .. .. .	7
	(Witness Nos. : 1, 9, 11, 14, 16, 48 and 69).	
	(b) Scouts .. .. .	7
	(Witness Nos. : 10, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 61).	
	(c) Officials .. .. .	3
	(Witness Nos. : 19, 47 and 50).	
	(d) Boatmen .. .. .	6
	(Witness Nos. : 31, 32, 33, 36, 38 and 39).	
3.	<i>Ferry Contractors</i> .. .. .	3
	(Witness Nos. : 28, 29 and 54).	
4.	<i>Relatives of the deceased who were not in Bhadrachalam at the time of the Accident</i> .. .. .	5
	(Witness Nos. : 68, 71, 72, 73 and 76).	
5.	<i>Other Officials</i> .. .. .	12
	(Witness Nos. : 20, 21, 22, 23, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52 and 77).	
6.	<i>Photographers</i> .. .. .	2
	(Witness Nos. : 5 and 8).	
7.	<i>Rescuers</i> .. .. .	2
	(Witness Nos. : 6 and 7).	
8.	<i>Other Non-Officials</i> .. .. .	14
	(Witness Nos. : 17, 18, 24, 25, 27, 35, 40, 41, 49, 53, 63, 65, 70, and 74).	

7. After the 28th May, 1957 some of the Members of the Committee were busy otherwise and so the report was finalised and approved on 14th June 1957. We are glad to report that the Committee is able to furnish a unanimous report as follows :—

8. The Temple of Sri Ramachandraswamy at Bhadrachalam on the left bank of the mighty river Godavari is celebrated and highly venerated shrine. It is believed that Sri Rama spent the most eventful period of his exile in these parts and the holiness and sanctity attached to this area is solely due to this legend. Bhadrachalam rose to religious prominence in the 17th Century during the reign of Abdul Hasan Tanesha at Golconda, due to the activities of that Great Saint Ramdas *alias* Kancherla Gopanna. Ramdas ranks among the galaxy of reputed Hindu savants like Purandara-das, Chaitanya and Paramahansa. He built the present temple, specially imported five brahmin priestly families to perform the duties of archakas in the Temple, arranged for proper worship, organised all the ceremonies and rituals obtaining in the temple and put them on a permanent and stable basis.

The river Godavari forms the natural boundary between the erstwhile Hyderabad and the Andhra States. Bhadrachalam Taluk and Division on the left bank is a part of the Agency area, of the East Godavari District. Borgampad Taluk, on the right bank is a part of Khammam District of Hyderabad State. Though the village and the temple are situated in Andhra State, the control and management of the shrine rested with the Hyderabad State *by virtue of the historical associations and the fact that the temple is maintained from the revenues of the Hyderabad State*. In other words, while the administration of the temple and its festival was in the hands of the former Hyderabad State, the responsibility for provision of protected water-supply, health and sanitation of the locality, provision of amenities to the pilgrims, maintenance of law and order and other allied matters devolved on the Andhra State resulting in dual administration of duties and responsibilities. This bifurcation of duties appears to continue even after the integration of the two States and has not yet brought about a sense of unified responsibility among the officers of both the sides of the river as will be detailed later on.

9. Before proceeding further the description of the river Godavari between Bhadrachalam and Borgampad is necessary.

Exhibit No. A-26 is a sketch of the bed of the river at this place prepared to scale 1"=100' by Witness No. 77 Assistant Engineer, Sri Suryanarayana Murthy and gives a correct idea of the physical features of the locality and various points in the river bed which are relevant for the purposes of this enquiry. 'H' is *Perumala Revu* and 'J' is *Brahmana Revu*. Between these two points there is a reef of black stones marked 'FG' jutting out into the river. To the north of it there is a deep pool and 'BD' is the ferry going over that pool used this year. 'KL' is the old ferry line used in previous years.

10. Of all the festivals in this Temple, Seeta Kalyanam celebrated on the birth day of Sree Rama is the most important. It comes off on a *Chitra Suddha Navami*—corresponding to March and April. This festival is widely advertised and draws pilgrims from almost the whole of the Andhra Desa. Large concourse of pilgrims gather in Bhadrachalam one or two days before the actual birth day of Sri Rama and leave as soon as the marriage festival is over. During this period, the water-level of the river is usually low. Though the temple is on the Andhra side, the most frequented route is by rail, viz: Dornakal to Kothagudum and from there by bus to Gummur in Borgampad Taluka on the right bank of the river. People coming from Andhra Districts adopt mainly this route, cross the river at Gummur and reach Bhadrachalam on the other side though some pilgrims come by river, bus and foot from West Godavari, Krishna and Guntur *via* Ashwaraopet and Tirur.

11. Our enquiry shows that it is admitted on all hands that the river was never a serious impediment at this place at this part of the year for people crossing over. Everyone admits that from 60 to 70% of the pilgrims used to walk across the river wading through shallow waters and only a small percentage such as women and children crossed by boats. The place usually used for this purpose is known as *Brahmana Revu* marked 'J' in Exhibit No. A-26. At this place the river is never deep during the season. People wade across and boats also ply here carrying a small percentage of pilgrims. Exhibit No. A-27 is a cross-section of the river at the old ferry point 'KL' in Exhibit No. A-26. Depth of the water at the deepest part is 7' 4". Exhibit No. A-28 is a similar cross-section across 'BD' in Exhibit No. A-28 at *Perumala revu*, and the deepest part is 9' 40". These readings were taken on 26th and 28th April, 1957. The evidence is that the level was little higher

on 10-4-57 and as such the depth at these two places must have been rather higher. There is a guage recording the level in the river at point 'M' in Exhibit No. A-26. Usually the reading at this place is about 4 to 4.2 ft. in April whereas this year it was upto 5.8 to 6.6'. This rise in water level made it impossible for people to walk across and necessitated all people crossing only by boats. For reasons which will be detailed later on the usual ferry point at 'KL' was changed to 'BD' to a point higher up to the river. As already stated the river is usually deeper here than at Brahmana Revu and more so this year than in previous years. The ferrying of pilgrims this year was only done at this point and it is here that the ferrying accident resulting in great loss of life took place. We shall first of all state how the incident occurred and then discuss the causes relating thereto.

12. This year the Kalyanam was performed on 9-4-57. It was published in the press and also through hand outs as can be seen from Exhibit No. A-18. But still some uncertainty seems to have agitated the mind of the public as 8th April, 1957 was declared as public holiday by the Government for Sri Rama Navami. The Temple authorities however, decided to celebrate it on 9th April, 1957, which according to Vyshnava Sampradayakam was declared to be the proper day. It is stated that many believed that the festival would take place on 8th April, 1957 and started reaching Bhadrachalam even on 6th and 7th April 1957 and were forced to stay for an additional day resulting in some economic strain. This year the number of pilgrims was phenominally large, estimated from 40 to 50 thousand against a normal of 20 to 25 thousand. So, soon after the Kalyanam was over on the 9th between 12 noon and 1 p.m. the pilgrims were anxious to leave, and gathered in large numbers on the river sands. On the 9th ferrying went on alright without any serious mishap. On the morning of the 10th between 8 and 9 a.m. two boats, one large and one small, were tied together side to side, star-board to port by ropes and were used for ferrying and they had made one or two trips already before 9 a.m. During the trip in question, it is estimated that between 300 to 400 people scrambled into the boat pell-mell. After the boats went about 100 yards, they stopped in mid stream, the bigger boat was found to sink at the stern. There was some scare among the passengers. People were seen trying to jump from the bigger to the smaller boat. This resulted in heavy rush to the star-board side of the bigger boat to which the port side of the smaller boat was tied. When, therefore,



the star-board side of the bigger boat was pressed down by the rush, the port-side of the smaller boat was also pressed down, the two ropes binding the boats acted as a fulcrum, the star-board side of the small boat rose up and it capsized on the top of the bigger boat, virtually acting as a lid over a box and imprisoned all the passengers between the two boats. There must have been a considerable amount of luggage in the small boat which must have fallen on the hapless victims and prevented them from coming up. Further, from the list of the dead we see that most of them were women. Salvage operations showed that they were found in groups of three or four clutching or embracing one another in mortal fear. It is, therefore, obvious that these factors must have contributed for so many going down like stones without any effort to save themselves. These facts are culled out from the evidence of Eye Witnesses and the survivors mentioned in para (6) supra.

13. We shall now deal with the causes of this disaster:-

### **Rise in Water Level in the River**

(i) The first factor no doubt is the fact that this year, unlike previous years, the river was not fordable by walk and could be crossed only by boats, the reason being a rise in the water level. It is suggested in the press as well as on the floor of the Assembly that the tampering with the locks and sluices at Dummugudam was the cause of this rise. Others opine that it was not so and the rise in the water level was due to rain in the higher reaches of the river. It was suggested that the Ferry contractors wanted to prevent people from walking across depriving them of the ferry-fare and so adopted reprehensible methods, and induced the Anicut authorities at Dummugudam to open the locks and sluices allowing water into the river. This, if true, is a very serious allegation calling for severe punishment of the culprits, and the Committee was, therefore, keen on probing into this matter thoroughly. During the enquiry at Bhadrachalam, all the concerned witnesses were questioned about this, but no serious attempt was made by anyone to urge this as a point before us. Though people were invited to furnish necessary information about this, no one came forward to speak about it, except one or two references to vague rumours. The Committee, however, did not want to allow the matter to rest there. They therefore, went to Dummugudam on 27th

April and inspected the Anicut, the sluices and the locks. A sketch describing the various details relating thereto are furnished in Exhibit No. A-19. The Anicut is about  $\frac{3}{4}$ th mile long (6 furlongs). It is in two steps, the left part thousand feet long being lower than the right part by a foot. The branch anicut is close to the lock and is lower than the lock crest by another foot. In the main Anicut, at a distance of 1,200 ft. from the left Abutment, there are six scouring sluices. These sluices are usually according to the schedule closed on 15th June of every year and opened about the 16th April of the succeeding year. Accordingly an order Exhibit No. A-17 was issued by the Executive Engineer, Dhowleshwaram ordering the closure of the lock and the opening of the sluices on 15th April. The Anicut Superintendent carried out this order and opened the sluices on 16-4-57 from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. Exhibit No. A-29 is a Daily Reading Register from 10-4-57 and this fact about the opening of the sluices is noted against the date 16-4-57 and marked as Exhibit No. A-29(a).

(ii) Witness No. 43 Shri Siva Subramanyam is a Superintending Engineer, Dhowleshwaram Circle and Dommugudam is in his charge. He was at Bhadrachalam on the 8th and 9th April, 1957 and was at Dummugudam on the 10th morning but had not yet gone to the Anicut when the District Superintendent of Police met him at the Head-lock and informed him about the accident. Both of them came over to Bhadrachalam at about noon. The Daily Reading Register of Dommugudam Anicut was later on handed over to the Superintendent of Police that very day. This Register was produced before us and is marked Exhibit A-15. It shows that there was over-flow over the anicut even in March 1957 and from 1-4-1957, the daily reading ranged from .9 to 1.2 on 10-4-57. This means that on 10-4-1957 the whole anicut was over-flowing and there was actually 2" of water even over the sluice platform. The Anicut Superintendent, Witness No. 42, says that he notes the readings himself every day and they are true. He produced Exhibit No. A-16, a wire dated 6-4-1957 sent by the Executive Engineer, Dhowleshwaram to him to send daily readings till the 15th of April, 1957, and he says that as directed he sent daily readings by wire. Witness No. 43, the Superintending Engineer, was directed to produce the original telegrams sent by the Anicut Superintendent and he is alleged to have sent the originals to the Chief Engineer, Irrigation, by his letter D.O. 115, dated 2-5-57. The Chief Engineer, Mr. L. Venkata Krishna Iyyer, a member of the

Committee, stated that he did not receive the letter and he complained to the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Hyderabad about the non-delivery of that letter, and he also applied for certified copies of the telegrams sent by the Anicut Superintendent. The Superintendent of Post Offices has submitted certified copies of the telegrams dated 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 14th April, 1957 from Dummugudam to Dhowleshwaram with his covering letter marked Exhibit No. A-34 and the certified copies of telegrams are Exhibit No. A-33 Series (33-33 F.). These telegrams are copies of the entries on the corresponding dates in the Reading Register Exhibit No. A-15. Witness No. 43 states that he heard on the 10th about the rumour regarding the opening of the sluices, but did not verify about the truth or otherwise of that statement though he says he was at the Anicut on the 11th April, 1957. According to him when the Anicut was over-flowing, it does not matter whether sluices are opened or shut as it would not in either case affect the flow in the river and did not, therefore, think it necessary to look into the matter further. This might be so but a serious allegation is made against his subordinates that the sluices were opened before time and kept open under his very nose and so one would expect him to see for himself whether the allegation was true or false. His evidence about the closing or opening of the sluices on the 11th when he was there, would have been the best and direct evidence possible and as he failed to do so we are constrained to depend on inferences. We are, however, satisfied that the telegrams Exhibit No. A-33 Series are genuine and if the Anicut was actually over-flowing from 1-4-57, it does not seem to serve any purpose to open the sluices.

(iii) (a) The Committee also wanted to examine the *modus operandi* for opening the sluices and the Chief Engineer arranged for a practical demonstration. The Committee could get access to that portion of the Anicut only by boat, which also could not reach the place straight as the bed was rocky and the boat was knocking against boulders in the river bed. The boat had, therefore, to make a long circuitous detour to reach the spot. The lower section was still over-flowing. Out of the six sluices, two were out of order; one was completely closed and could not be opened, as the gear was out of order, and the other sluice was jammed at a height of one and half feet from the bottom and would not rise or fall. Only the other four sluices were open and discharging water. The Committee wanted a demonstration of how the sluice gates

were raised or lowered. The spanner for operating the screw of the gates is in two parts of heavy iron material. It requires two men to carry them from the boat. In addition, two heavy iron rods, which serve as handles to turn the gear, had also to be carried. The fitting of the spanner and handles to the shaft took fifteen minutes, requiring the assistance of six men. Even the operation of the iron handles alone was found very strenuous and tiresome, and so a large wooden pole had to be inserted between the handles and used for turning the gear. This also was a very labourious process. The attempt was to close the sluice shutter which was open. Though the men were at it for nearly 20 minutes, no substantial change took place either in closing the door or in reducing the discharge though gravitation helped to bring down the gate. The Committee felt certain that the operation of sluices was a very labourious task, requiring technical knowledge and a large number of trained men and entailing considerable time. Raising of a closed door is said to be much more arduous, as people had to work against gravity, and we, therefore, believe that it is well-nigh impossible to do this surreptitiously, and could be done if at all only in day time. According to Exhibit No. A-29 (a) raising of the four gates took nearly a day and from our observation we have no hesitation in testifying that it must have taken so much time. Further, we noticed that though the sluices were open and discharging water, there was still over-flow over the anicut also. The level over the crest was 0·8' on 27-4-1957 according to Exhibit No. A-29 (b) which is the Reading Book similar to Exhibit No. A-15 and contain daily entries from 10-4-1957 to 18-5-1957. The evidence before us also is to the effect that the level of the water in the river on 26th and 27th April was just about what it was on the 10th or slightly lower.

(b) There are lock gates for working the locks shown in Exhibit No. A-19. This controls the flow in the canal. These are huge gates which cannot be easily operated. Even so, they admit water only into the narrow canal shown in Exhibit No. A-19, and cannot add much to the water level in the river.

(c) Witness Nos. 2, 7, 18, 21, 24, 42, 43 and 63 have deposed that there was rain accompanied by gale on the 8th night. Witness No. 24, Mr. Kondal Rao is a bus owner and witness No. 63 is a resident of Bhadrachalam. Both of them say that buses could not ply on the 9th morning

between Parnashala and Bhadrachalam as the three upstreams *Thallapuru*, *Gubbalmangi* and *Thoorpuvagu* flowing into Godavari were unfordable. There is no reason to disbelieve their evidence.

(d) While on this point we may also refer to Exhibit No. A-14—a petition which was presented to us at Dummugudam by its residents including local Congressmen and the evidence of witness Nos. 40 & 41 is that they usually frequent the Anicut area and that the allegation that the sluices were interfered with was not true. Witness No. 41 is a fisherman who is invariably engaged as a cooly for operating the sluices and he says that the sluices were opened only on the 16th. In 1956 the Kalyanam took place on the 18th or 19th April according to witness No. 45, the Revenue Divisional Officer. A reference to Exhibit No. A-15 shows that on 1-4-1956 the over-flow over the anicut was only 0·6 and it came down to 0·3 on 18th and 19th. This shows how it was possible to ford the river by walk then, while this year it became impossible to do so.

For all the above reasons the committee feels satisfied that allegation about the interference of the sluices is baseless and the rise in the water level in the river was due only to natural causes namely rain in the catchment area.

### Change in the Ferry Point

14. (a) The next point to be considered is that the ferry point was changed from *Brahmana Revu* to *Perumalla Revu* this year. This is admitted even by the ferry contractors and boatmen (Witness Nos. 28, 29, 32, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39 and 54). The usual yearly arrangement was that buses used to discharge pilgrims at Gummur marked 'Z' in Exhibit No. A-26. From there, people used to go down the bank directly into the river and proceed to the water side under the shade of a long pandal which used to be erected for that purpose. Thereafter, many used to walk across the shallow waters while some went by boats. On the Bhadrachalam side a barricaded enclosure for inoculation purposes used to be put up near the water's edge at Brahmana Revu. A long pandal for shelter was also provided leading therefrom to the Bhadrachalam bank. Pilgrims were disembarked into this enclosure and after examination and inoculation, if necessary, they walked under the shade of the long pandal to the bank on Bhadrachalam side. This is marked 'P' in Exhibit No. A-26. On the return journey also the pilgrims used to reach this point and either forded

the river or crossed it by boat, but always at this point. The boats anchored opposite to these sheds and took off from the same place. The inoculation shed was used on this occasion as a resting place in which people were required to sit and the outlet to the boats was under control and embarkation was regulated easily by a small number of policemen. The fact that the number of people crossing by boat was small also helped in regulating the traffic. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Witness No. 45, has stated before the Committee that though sheds were, as usual, put up, they were not used by the pilgrims due to the change in the ferry point and ultimately the materials were appropriated by the pilgrims for fuel and other purposes. Perumalla Revu, we are told was previously used only for bathing and a little higher up a pump was usually installed to provide drinking water to the village. This point was never used as a wharf for the ferry.

(b) The ferry contractor had stated that in connection with the conduct of elections of 1956 a jeepable road was laid in the bed of the river on the Borgampad side opposite to the Perumalla Revu and all traffic was diverted to this point and so they continued to use the same point for the ferry (marked 'B-D' in Exhibit No. A-26). This might be so on ordinary days, but it is clear that this point was very inconvenient to pilgrims during this year's festival. The bus stand at Gummur is about a mile off from the crossing; pilgrims alight from the buses and get straight into the river immediately opposite. Finding no ferry or any other arrangement for conveyance and the river being unfordable, they were obliged to walk on the blazing sands all the way to the new point (marked 'B' in Exhibit No. A-26) nearly two furlongs off in the hot sun and get into the boats at the new point, (*vide* Evidence of Witness Nos. 24, 65 and 74) of Messrs. Kondala Rao, Venugopal Nayagar and E. V. Padmanabhan. There was no other means of conveyance to carry them to the new point even on the bank on the Borgampad side. Further as the river was not fordable all the pilgrims must have been at the mercy of the boatmen and we are quite satisfied that this year the pilgrims must have been put to great deal of suffering on this account. During our stay at Bhadrachalam we actually found boats plying at the old ferry point. The water level there on the days of festival was a little higher, and it must have been quite easy to work the ferry at this point between the 6th and 10th of April, 1957. Still the contractors did not use that point under the facile plea that the boats used to strike sand and rocks there when fully loaded.

This would not have happened if the boats were loaded to normal capacity. The contractors were anxious to make as much money as possible and so were loading the boats beyond all reasonable limits and it is, therefore, quite possible that the boats struck the sand at the old point. The river being deep at the new point, boats could be loaded to any extent, and so the contractors must have gladly accepted this new ferry point. In fact this has been admitted in so many words by Witness No. 29, Sri K. Appa Rao, Ferry Contractor, Bhadrachalam.

(c) The phenomenal increase this year in the bid amount for the ferries on both the sides was another important reason why the contractors were eager to exploit the situation for deriving as large a sum as possible in the shape of fares. On the Borgampad side where the rate of ferry toll is 2 annas per head, the auction amount realised for the current year was Rs. 18,000 as against the average of only Rs. 5,500 for the last five years from 1951-1955. It was Rs. 13,000 in 1956-57. The rate of tariff on the Bhadrachalam side is only 3 naye paise and still the ferry auction for 1957 fetched Rs. 11,600 as against the average amount of Rs. 5,400 in the years preceding; as per figures furnished by Witness No. 23, Tahsildar of Bhadrachalam. Various reasons are given for this increase—one such being is the establishment of I.L.T.D. Factory and resultant trade in tobacco. But this has been going on from 1952 according to evidence of Witness No. 21, and cannot therefore, be a decisive factor. Similarly the fact that two Kalyanam Festivals come off in 1957-58 is not also convincing. This was not spoken to by witness No. 29, the contractor, when he was first examined. He said that the bid was raised because the river was not fordable at the time of the bid and was not expected to become fordable later on and so they expected a large boat traffic. It is, therefore, abundantly clear that the ferry point was changed this year by the contractors mainly on this ground.

(d) Usually there used to be two contractors—one on either side of the river—and the ferry points located exactly opposite to each other. The fixation of ferry point on Bhadrachalam side necessarily depended on the location of the point on the right bank of the river. But this year both the contracts have merged in the same person. The original contractor on Bhadrachalam side was Witness No. 29, K. Appa Rao. He sub-leased his lease in violation of the conditions of lease to Witness No. 28, B. Ramiah for Rs. 12,400. This Ramiah was also acting as the Agent of the Contractor

on Borgampad side namely : Witness No. 54, Mr. M. Ramiah. This man no doubt denies this agency but B. Ramiah has given a statement to Revenue Divisional Officer Exhibit No. A-22 wherein he has definitely admitted this agency, and the traffic on both the sides was controlled this year by this man and he could do what he pleased. It is also proved beyond doubt that no tickets were ever issued at the banks to the passengers and that collections were made in the boat itself during the crossing for fear that people might jump and run away after reaching the bank. Four annas per passenger seems to have been accepted as the fare though the conditions of lease prescribe it as half-anna on the Bhadrachalam side and 2 annas on the other side. While we cannot say that the change in the location of ferry point need have necessarily resulted in this calamity, it is certainly a contributory factor because the river being narrower and shallower at the old point it would have been much easier for people to save themselves or be saved in the event of the boats capsizing.

### **Inadequacy of the Number of Boats**

15. As pointed out earlier, about 40 thousand pilgrims attended the festival this year as against the usual crowd of 20,000 and the bulk of them had to be ferried across the river in a day or two on their return journey. Evidence tendered goes to show that nobody connected with the administration of the Temple or the District Board cared to ascertain well in advance of the Festival Day whether adequate number of boats were available and they were river-worthy. The Revenue Divisional Officer (Witness No. 45) no doubt states that by 9-4-1957 about 10 boats were plying but the other evidence is very conflicting. The evidence of Shri Sambayya, Assistant Regional Scouts Commissioner, (Witness No. 61) and that of other witnesses 55 to 59 and some other evidence also go to show that only 4 to 6 boats were seen plying on the 9th. On the 10th April the evidence is that two boats tied together were alone plying and they made two or three trips before the accident. Exhibit No. A-10 is a photo taken of the two boats soon after they left the bank and just before the accident. A scrutiny of the photo shows that in addition to these two boats actually on duty, two other boats were found at the sandy island. We are, therefore of opinion that on the morning of 10th April adequate number of boats were not put into service by the contractors in spite of the specific instructions of the President, East Godavari Agency District Board to them to ply as many boats as



possible to relieve any apprehended congestion in ferry traffic (*vide* Exhibit No. A-31). The number of pilgrims to be ferried across was estimated at 4 to 5 thousand and it is, therefore, no wonder that there was a great stampede by pilgrims to get into the few available boats and return to their homes as quickly as possible.

### **Condition of the Ill-Fated Boats**

16. The most important factor which perhaps is the main and prominent cause for the disaster was the putting into service of a leaky boat. This was also a cargo boat as all the other boats were. It is of 12 ton's capacity. This boat was kept under proper custody after the accident and was examined on 16-4-1957 by Mr. E. Floate, Junior Superintendent, P.W.D. Workshops, Dhowleshwaram. His report Exhibit No. A-11 shows that it was a very old boat in a rotten condition and not fit to be used for passenger traffic. The boat had many holes at the bilges, stern, below feeder and two large holes at the bilge port-side at 14th and 15th rib from stern, 6 inches from the bottom and a big hole 9" from the top. These holes were stopped by rags and cement which had fallen away and the holes are clearly seen. Our inspection note recorded in Exhibit No. A-30 also corroborates the evidence of Exhibit A-11 that the boat was absolutely not in a fit condition to be employed for transporting passengers. It is also in evidence that this leaky boat along with the 9 ton load capacity boat had already made two or three trips before the accident each time carrying excessive load. Water must have naturally got in to a sufficient depth in the boat and no endeavour was apparently made to bale it out. So on the last trip considerable quantity of water had probably accumulated in the bottom of the boat. Two reasons have been adduced for tying the two boats together. Firstly, it is said that the smaller boat was not steady and likely to tilt easily and so it was tied to the big boat. This appears to have happened once or twice on the previous day. Secondly, it is explained that jointly both the boats together could carry more passengers than they could individually. Both the reasons are plausible.

### **Stoppage of the Boats in the Mid-Stream**

17. It is also abundantly clear from the evidence that the boats were stopped in the mid-stream and the boatmen actually went about demanding fares and there was some

protest and confusion. According to Witness No. 75 this went on for some appreciable time resulting in the boat taking in more water and capsizing as already explained. As some of the witnesses put it, if the boats were not stopped in the midstream and were piloted across promptly, this calamity might perhaps not have occurred in spite of all the serious defects pointed out above. The Committee feels that this is another important factor which brought about the disaster.

### **Arrangements for Police Bandobust**

18. (a) During Festival season this year the Circle Inspector Witness No. 47 sent a requisition for 20 Head Constables and 100 Constables by Exhibit No. A-25. The Office Note thereon says that the usual allowed strength was 14 Head Constables and 80 Constables but the D.S.P. has sanctioned the full quota asked for by the Circle Inspector by his order dated 29.3.1957 (Exhibit No. A-24). The evidence is that all these men reached Bhadrachalam in time and were assigned various duties during the festival. The D.S.P. as Witness No. 46 says that on the 9th April when he reached Bhadrachalam at 1 p.m. he found a boat heavily loaded and that he instructed the Inspector to divert all the Constables at the Temple to the Ferry Stand to regulate the traffic. The Circle Inspector Shri Veeraswamy, Witness No. 47 says that on the 9th there were 2 Head Constables and 12 Constables at the ferry point and that a cordon was formed with the reserve police and other police constables, and that he did all he could to ferry the large crowd waiting to be transported. He also says that he saw a number of pilgrims marooned on the sandy island and so he went there and coaxed and threatened the contractors to provide boats for them to go to Borgampad side. Witness Nos. 55 to 58 are scouts from Kothagudam and Witness No. 61 is the Regional Assistant State Organising Scouts Commissioner state that they found a Circle Inspector and a number of policemen on the 9th at the wharf and that they also co-operated with the police in controlling the crowd and arranging for their safe transport. Witness No. 47, the Circle Inspector, Witness No. 61 Mr. Sambayya, and Witness No. 10 Mr. R. Krishnamurthy state that they met on the 9th night in Chitrakootam in the Temple and discussed the plans for bandobust at the wharf next morning as the crowd was unusually large. They also state that on the 10th morning policemen and scouts met at the wharf, formed a cordon and made arrangements for controlling the crowd and for their safe transport across the river.

Witnesses Nos. 55—58 and 61 who were scouts deposed on the strength of their pledge and ideals of scouting that they were deposing truthfully without fear or favour. According to their evidence there were 30—40 policemen and 70 scouts some in the cordon and some in the waters trying to control the crowd. Witnesses Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 16 and 24 also say that they saw a Circle Inspector and a number of policemen and scouts on duty at the wharf doing their best to control the crowd. Witness No. 1, is a Medical Graduate from Eluru. He found about 50—60 policemen and scouts arranging a cordon and regulating the crowd. Witness No. 2, is a Godown-keeper, Central Bank of India, Eluru. He found 20—30 policemen and 50 scouts controlling the crowd. Witness Nos. 55—58 and 61 are scouts whose evidence in the opinion of the Committee is entitled to due weight. The essence of the entire evidence on this point is to the effect that a large number of policemen and scouts were on duty on the 9th and 10th April but the crowd which had to be ferried by boats became very large and the scramble for getting into the boats was very great and exceeded their capacity. Witness No. 61, Mr. Sambiah states that at day break on the 10th he along with 70 scouts repaired to the bank where he saw about 30—40 policemen on duty. He and his men volunteered for service and took up positions along with the police in putting a cordon. He has corroborated the fact that the people were complaining of having to over-stay and were anxious to get back. In spite of their best efforts, he admits, they could not control the crowd effectively and some pilgrims broke the cordon and got into the boats in defiance of all arrangements made by the police and the scouts. We feel that the evidence of Mr. Sambiah and his band of young scouts and that of other witnesses enumerated above tend to show that on the morning of the 10th, about 20—30 police constables captained by one or two police officers and assisted by 70 scouts were on duty and did their best to control the crowd, but the task exceeded their capacity. We do not see any reason why credence should not be given to the evidence of these witnesses. After the examination of Mr. Veeraswamy, Witness No. 47 was over, the Chairman enquired from all those present at the enquiry if any body would like to challenge the statement of the Circle Inspector. Witness No. 48, Bandam Chander Rao who called himself a member of the Communist Party stood up and said that there were only 3 or 4 constables with the Circle Inspector in addition to 10 or 15 scouts; and that no cordon was put. He also said that he could not lead any other witness to corroborate his

statement. Immediately Witness No. 49, Sri D. Pundarikakshudu, Retired Head Clerk, Collector's Office, Bhadrachalam, got up and contradicted the statement of the Communist Party member and asserted that he did see 20 constables and scouts on the 9th, and 25 to 30 constables and the Circle Inspector on the 10th. He was not present at the time of the accident but came immediately after and found about 30—40 constables and scouts. Witness No. 24, Mr. Kondala Rao, is a respectable resident of the place. He has been the President of the Taluk Congress Committee for a number of years and was also Vice-President of the District Board. He said that he saw police men controlling the crowd on the 9th, and came soon after the accident on the 10th morning and noticed 40—50 policemen. After shifting all available evidence, we have no hesitation in accepting the statement that the Circle Inspector Shri Veeraswamy along with a large number of police constables and scouts was present at the wharf on the 10th morning and did his best to control the crowd, and prevent overloading of the boats, but the task exceeded the capacity of the policemen and the scouts.

(b) One other factor that added to the confusion is the dislocation this year in the inoculation arrangement. In previous years at Brahmana Revu water's edge barricaded sheds were put up into which pilgrims coming from Borgampad side were led, examined and inoculated if necessary. Thereafter they were allowed to go into Bhadrachalam. On the return journey also people came into the barricaded enclosure from where they were properly controlled, regulated and put into boats. This year the Revenue Divisional Officer has stated that such sheds were put up at Brahmana Revu but as the ferry was not working there, nobody landed near those sheds and the materials of the sheds were removed and taken away by the pilgrims for fuel and other purposes. No such shed could thereafter be put up at Perumalla Revu as it was too late to do so as the pilgrims began to arrive. Inoculation arrangements were therefore, also not made at the water's edge but in various places in the village. If such a barricaded shed or sheds had been put up at Perumalla Revu it would have largely helped in controlling the crowd. As it is the police and the scouts were left with a long unguarded water front and a large crowd to be controlled who were in a mood to get back as quickly as possible. This must have also resulted in great confusion and stampede at the water's edge. It is, therefore, not difficult to imagine how the police and scouts failed to effectively control the crowd and to see that the boats were not overcrowded.

The committee feels that if the District Superintendent of Police and his Deputy Superintendent had taken care to be present at the river early on the 10th morning, they might have possibly organised things better. It is also clear that the police were powerless in controlling the boatmen and the contractors who were under the administrative control of the District Board on the Bhadrachalam side and the Revenue Department on the Borgampad side.

### **Overloading in the Boats**

19. The boats used were not meant for carrying human beings but were only cargo boats. There were no seating arrangements. Calculated according to cubical contents the small boat could carry only 24 passengers and the big boat 32, whereas there is overwhelming evidence to show that about 300 pilgrims got into these two boats. The Excise Sub-Inspector, Witness No. 19, has taken a photo of these boats as they were leaving on the last trip. It is marked exhibit No. A-10. A look at it shows that it was not the way to load a boat with human beings. The persons were all over the boats herded like cattle. There must have been many more packed like sardines in the hold. It is a live cargo likely to shift and easily tilt the balance of the boat. The Excise Sub-Inspector said that he took the photo out of simple curiosity. It was obvious that he was only displaying a sense of official comradeship and did not want to admit overloading of boats for fear of blame attaching to any officer. The extraordinary overloading alone must have induced him to take the photo. The Committee is of definite opinion that the boats must have been literally groaning under excessive weight. What the boatmen used to do was to take the passengers to a sandy island half way across the river by these boats and disembark them there, from where they were carried by other boats to the other side or were required to wade across the other arm. The boat contractor admitted that on each round, his cashier received about Rs. 150. The evidence shows that no collections were made or could be made at the time of embarkation. So the boatmen must have stopped mid-way and attempted to collect the fares. Meanwhile, the boat began to draw water and the hole near the stern had gone under water and water was pouring in through that. Someone cried out that the boat was sinking, this created panic. People attempted to jump into the other boat and the tragedy became inevitable as stated above. There is, therefore, no question that the primary responsibility for the boat tragedy rests on the contractors and the boatmen.

## Auctioning of the Ferries and the conditions of Lease

20. On the Bhadrachalam side the ferry auction is conducted every year by the President of the East Godavari Agency District Board. Exhibit No. A-21 is a Notification appearing in the District Gazette issued by the District Board. It contains the date of sale, the conditions and rules governing the sale of 19 ferries of which Bhadrachalam is the 10th according to the list attached to the Notification. At the top of the Notification, reference is made to various Notifications and Government Orders issued from 1892 to 1955, purporting to be under Section 12 and 16 of the Madras Canal and Public Ferries Act II of 1890. The power to auction the ferry and to recover the fee was delegated to the District Board under Section 4 of the Act, and so the rules shown in the Notification are valid, have the force of law and ought to be enforced strictly. Witness No. 43 says that country crafts and ferries plying in the river are not subjected to registration and are liable for registration only when they ply in the canal. Witness No. 44, Collector, East Godavari District, says that no rules have been framed for private crafts plying in the Godavari river and that the Canal and Ferries Act should be made applicable to such crafts also. In the face of the Notifications mentioned above, we are unable to understand these statements. We do not propose to send for all the Notifications mentioned above and examine the correctness or otherwise of the statements made by the Collector as this would involve inordinate delay in tracing out the Notifications from as long ago as 1892. We, therefore, leave it to the Government to get these statements examined and clarified further. Suffice it for our purpose to state that the auction was held subject to the rules mentioned in the Notification and they are definitely binding on the contractors irrespective of the question whether they were framed under the Act or not. Rule No. 1 states that the renter should provide himself with the boats required and keep them in good repair. Rule 1 (b) says that the renter should issue tickets noting the prescribed rates and the actual amount collected. Again Rule 3 ordains that the Renter shall have sufficient number of boats in readiness at the ferry and take care that passengers are not unnecessarily delayed and are ferried over with expedition. Under Rule No. 7, the President of the East Godavari Agency District Board shall determine the weight of the cargo and the number of passengers which each boat can safely carry and shall also prescribe the number and class of boats to be maintained by the renters, and the

number of men who work in them. Rule 8 says that the number of persons and weight of cargo shall be legibly painted on the boats in English and Vernacular and no passenger or cargo in excess shall at any time be allowed on the boats. The renter shall not use any boat other than those marked as aforesaid. Rule No. 9 prohibits sub-lease without prior sanction. It is patent that no attention was ever paid to enforce these rules. The Collector, witness No. 44 states that the "ferries" are not subjected to any inspection under the statute. Under the present rule there is no such provision. There is no practice that the boat should be certified. It is evident from previous record that no such thing was done. It was left to the contractors. There was no *suo moto* checking with regard to non-issue of tickets. The District Board cannot take the decision about the number of boats required. The contractor might decide how many people might be coming. The discretion is given to him. We leave it to the contractor to ply as many boats as he considers necessary. It was never anticipated that the river would be a bottle-neck during the festival and that in the past more than 65% of the people used to walk through the river. This no doubt may appear a plausible justification if the rules quoted above are meant to apply only during festival seasons. But as it is the rules are meant to be enforced all through the year even during the period when the river is in high flood. It is, therefore, very extraordinary that no official thought of enforcing these rules all these years. Even non-official Vice-Presidents of the District Board like witness No. 24 do not seem to have been aware of these rules, and never tried to enforce them, though they were ready enough to complain after the accident that this and that should have been done to safeguard the river traffic. This is the position on the Bhadrachalam side.

On the Borgampad side the position is still worse. Witness No. 21, B. Suryanarayana, Tahsildar, Borgampad has stated that he conducted the auction subject to the confirmation of the Collector. He has also stated that the notification for auction was issued under the Hyderabad Ferries Act of 1315 Fasli. He produced a manuscript notification in Urdu, exhibit No. A-13. According to him, the conditions of the contract are only the following :—

1. That the period of contract is one year.
2. That the contractor is bound to follow the rules and regulations of the Government.

3. That 2 annas per head should be charged.
4. That 2 annas per maund may be charged for luggage in excess of 40 seers.

He also frankly admits that there is no rule that the contractor should keep a particular number of boats and that they should be certified. No rules are supplied to the contractor and there is no system of examining the boats.

21. An analysis of the whole evidence brings out the following points for serious consideration :

The Temple at Bhadrachalam is responsible for drawing large number of pilgrims from all over the country on festival occasions. It must, therefore, be their primary concern to look after their welfare and provide all necessary amenities for their convenience. There are two committees called the Temple Committee which is a permanent committee and the Festival Committee which is an *ad hoc* one. The former consists of 12 members—officials and non-officials, the Collector, Khammam District being its Chairman and the Tahsildar, Borgampad, its Secretary. The Festival Committee at Bhadrachalam consists of the District Health Officer, Tahsildar, Sub-Assistant Agent and two non-officials. It is stated that the rituals and the arrangements inside the temple precincts are their only concern. They are not responsible for all arrangements outside the temple premises. It is further said that the temple contributes a sum of Rs. 800 (eight hundred) to the Agency District Board *vide* exhibit No. A-32 towards sanitary and other arrangements during Sri Rama Navami festival and that the District Board alone is responsible for all such arrangements. The Collector, Witness No. 44, also admits that it is the responsibility of the District Board to provide amenities like sanitary arrangements, water convenience, accommodation, etc., while there is no complaint as regards these arrangements, ferrying alone does not received adequate consideration at the hands of the District Board. The kind of boats used, their number, their river-worthiness, their carrying capacity is left entirely to the discretion of the contractor. There is no effective means of compelling the contractor to do anything. The only way of punishing the contractor or taking action against him is to give notice, cancel his contract and re-sell the ferry, at his risk. The old contractor is not even prevented from bidding at the



re-sale, and it usually happens he appears under a new name and bids at the re-sale to prevent any loss falling upon him. This is no control and is absolutely useless to provide on the spot facilities, for the pilgrims. The Tahsildar, Witness No. 22, Bhadrachalam, says that his duty is to put up some Pandals as ordered by the District Board and he is not authorised to control the ferry contractor. The Revenue Divisional Officer's duty is only to conduct the auction. On Borgampad side the position is worse. The Tahsildar auctions the ferry and is not concerned with what happens afterwards. This year no doubt on a complaint of charging excessive fare, the Tahsildar, Borgampad Witness No. 21 had the ferry worked under his supervision for a day but could not continue to do so as he had no power to take over the ferry. The picture that emerges out of these affairs is, therefore, one of absolute lack of responsibility as regards ferrying arrangements in any particular quarter. There is no one charged with the duty of looking after the convenience of the pilgrims especially with regard to ferrying. The fate of the pilgrims is no body's concern. They must be deemed to be in the good hands of the Lord and if He chooses to take them away, well, it is His pleasure. The Government must take immediate and serious notice of this state of affairs. This system if it can be so called must be ended at once and should immediately be replaced by another which will induce confidence in the public safeguard person and property and make such occurrences impossible in future at least so far as human knowledge and effort goes.

22. This report will perhaps not be complete without some reference to the salvage and relief operations and we therefore, propose to examine them briefly though they are outside the terms of reference. The tragedy occurred within 100 yards from the Boat Stand. Though there were thousands of people looking on from the bank, the evidence does not speak of any large number of people rushing to save the unfortunate people. Only some scouts and policemen appear to have got into the waters and a boat which was coming from the opposite direction was mainly used for rescuing the survivors. All the evidence points to the fact that all rescue operations were directed for recovering the bodies from the river bed. 24 people were rescued alive and sent to the hospital out of whom 8 died and 16 survived. The Revenue Divisional Officer, the Police Officers and other officials and non-officials seem to have arrived soon after the occurrence and attempts were made to fish out the bodies. According to the

evidence of the Revenue Divisional Officer, witness No. 45, till 8 p.m. on the 10th, 190 bodies were salvaged and 11 more bodies were recovered on the 11th April, 1957. Two more bodies were recovered lower down the river by search parties later. Thus the total dead bodies were 203 of whom 116 were females, 69 were men and 18 were children. 63 bodies were unidentified of whom photographs were taken by witness No. 5 marked as exhibit Nos. A-1 to 9. 139 bodies were identified and their names arranged district-war are given in Appendix II. 56 bodies were handed over to the relatives. The evidence is unanimous that the dead bodies were kept under proper guard, jewellery and other articles of value found on them were listed and taken care of. Such of those who identified the bodies and established their relation with them were handed over the bodies along with the articles found on them. The rest of the articles were inventoried and sent to the Additional First Class Magistrate, Bhadrachalam. Articles recovered subsequently were also sent to him and both these articles are being dealt with as and when the claims are being received. The photographs of the unidentified persons were exhibited in the local and Railway Police Stations for identification. The evidence of all the people who gathered in the river soon after the accident is that all possible arrangements for salvaging the dead bodies and safeguarding the properties were made and that the officials and non-officials co-operated and did all they could under the circumstances. Dead bodies were fast putrifying. They were buried late in the night at about 2-30 a.m. under the joint supervision and direction of the D.H.O., Dy.S.P. and the R.D.O.

The Revenue Divisional Officer says that he collected Rs. 305 and a bag of rice from the villagers and Rs. 100 from the Red Cross and arranged for feeding of the survivors, and their relatives and gave money and clothes to 22 persons who were in need of them and that nobody who applied for relief went without it. He also says that on the 10th he formed a Relief Committee of which witness No. 24, Shri Kondala Rao is a member, to assist him in this relief work. Shri Kondala Rao says that he made proper enquiries of the people who needed relief and all necessary help was given to them and is not aware of any one going without relief. No doubt one or two witnesses said that they did not receive any help. But even they do not say that they approached the Deputy Collector or any official for help. It is quite possible that a few persons might have escaped notice of the local officers. However,

the committee is satisfied that by and large the salvage and relief operations were done to the best of their ability by officials and non-officials considering the suddenness of the occurrence, the preoccupations of the officials with the dead bodies and their disposal and the severe strain on their promptness and resourcefulness.

Witnesses Nos. 60 and 66 had complained that some of their relatives were in the boat and their dead bodies were not subsequently found. The committee feels that in addition to 203 bodies actually salvaged it is quite possible some bodies might have been washed away in the current and so it is not possible to say as to how many people were actually drowned though the number of missing people might not be large.

### **Immediate Relief to the Bereaved Families**

23. With the concurrence of the other members of the committee the Chairman addressed a letter to the Government on 4th May, 1957 enclosing a copy of the identified bodies arranged district-war and informed them that the evidence showed that most of the families lost their breadwinners and were in a most helpless condition, and suggested to Government that on pure humanitarian considerations such families might be contacted and immediate relief be given to them to alleviate their sufferings. In this connection we draw particular attention to the statement of witness No. 53 and commend it to the Government for consideration. The committee hopes that Government have already taken adequate steps in the direction suggested in the letter of the Chairman, dated the 4th May, 1957.

### **Suggestions for the Future**

24. A bridge at the place is no doubt a permanent and effective way of solving the problem of ferry traffic. We are told that if Ramapadasagar Project comes into being not only the bridge but even the village of Bhadrachalam will be completely submerged and waters would reach up to the level of the sanctum sanctorum. This will perhaps necessitate the shifting of the temple itself to a different place. We do not know whether it is practicable or desirable. It will certainly wound the religious susceptibilities of the people. Even if the project does come in the Third Five-Year Plan the Sri Rama Navami festival will have to continue at the present spot for another decade or so. If, therefore, the

Ramapadasagar is not a live issue the question of construction of the bridge should be taken up at once and pushed through with all speed since a road link connecting Bhadrachalam and Borgampad has become more pressing as a result of the integration of the Hyderabad and Andhra States. However, since the road bridge may not come into existence for some appreciable time, we suggest the following measures to safeguard the interest of pilgrim population :—

(1) The question whether rules have been framed and published under the Canals & Ferries Act of 1890 should immediately be examined, and if necessary steps should be taken to frame such rules for controlling public and private ferries in all rivers in the State.

(2) The right to ply the boats in both the directions should be kept under one controlling authority.

(3) A permanent route for the ferry based on expert opinion should be marked and the question whether *Brahmana Revu* should not be so recognised, be immediately examined.

(4) Boats suitable for carrying passengers in comfort should be designed and introduced, their carrying capacity should be prominently marked out on the boats and an agency to prevent overloading should be provided.

(5) A permanent provision for periodical inspection of the boats analogous to inspection of public buses plying on roads should be made.

(6) Whether there is enough traffic or not it must be made a condition of the contract that the contractor should provide a particular number of boats during the festival occasions. The number of boats might be fixed with reference to the average attendance of pilgrims in the past five years.

(7) A responsible officer must be charged with the duty of superintending the ferry arrangements well in advance of the festivals and he must be suitably authorised to compel the contractors to carry out the instructions.

(8) A suitable barricade must be erected at the water's edge on the both sides of the ferry and entry into and egress therefrom should be properly controlled.

(9) Ticket system should immediately be enforced fixing reasonable rates for passenger and cargo traffic, and sufficient number of booths should be provided on both sides of the river for issue of tickets without delay.

(10) There should be a rescue and life-saving organization in sufficient strength at every largely attended festival.

(11) It has been the unanimous opinion of all those who attended the festival that proper arrangements for their stay, accommodation, food and such other amenities are not being provided. The committee understands that a considerable sum of about Rs. 10,000 is being collected every year as pilgrim tax. It is, therefore, necessary that the following conveniences should be provided for the pilgrim public :—

(i) A narrow pandal is put up on the river bed which is absolutely inadequate to afford shelter from the blazing sun. It is necessary that a large pandal capable of affording proper shelter to the large number of pilgrims should be erected.

(ii) The important festival for which the pilgrims gather is the *Kalyanam*. Every one of the pilgrims is anxious to witness the said function which takes place at mid-day. The pilgrims gather in large numbers around the *Kalyana Mandapam* and we are told that the pandal put up there is very inadequate, so much so that almost all the pilgrims are compelled to stand for hours in the hot sun. Sufficient shelter should, therefore, be provided at this place.

(iii) The question of providing suitable accommodation for stay for such a large number of people is a very big matter and it should be suitably examined and at least an effort must be made to extend such accommodation progressively year after year.

These are the lines on which safeguards must be provided and we hope that the Government would take steps to have them examined thoroughly and necessary safeguards provided to ensure the confidence of the public. We also hope that if these and such other effective control measures are adopted the extraordinary competition to raise the bids of the ferry giving rooms to reprehensible methods of extorting money will automatically be controlled.

### Acknowledgement

25. The committee is glad to state that its work has been greatly facilitated by the willing co-operation received from the Government, its officials and other non-officials. The committee also wishes to place on record the valuable services rendered by its Secretary, Shri K. G. Desikan. The

committee further appreciates the work done by the subordinate staff. Mr. V. V. Subramanyam, Superpintendent of the General Administration Department assisted the committee at the initial stages of the work until he was relieved by Mr. S. B. Raja, II Grade Clerk of the Board of Revenue. Sarvashri Kameshwar Rao, Telugu Stenographer and Bhaskar Rao and D. H. Rukmaji Rao, English Stenographers performed the very difficult task of taking down the statement of witnesses and typing them. Their work was to the entire satisfaction of the committee.

27. The committee regrets that it was not possible for them to finish their work within a fortnight as suggested by the Government in their G.O. No. 639, D/ 18-4-1957. Though the enquiry started promptly, practically the whole of May was taken up with the publishing of the notice in the press calling for statements from witnesses and examining them at Hyderabad. The Committee discussed the whole evidence on the 27th and 28th May, 1957 but the Chairman was unable to continue to remain at Hyderabad due to very urgent and unavoidable work at home. With all that the committee has taken just under two months to finish their work and they hope that it will not be considered an inordinately long time.

1. R. B. RAMKRISHNARAJU,  
*Chairman.* 14-6-1957.

2. L. VENKATAKRISHNA IYER,  
16-6-1957.

3. GULAM HYDER,  
21-6-1957.

4. N. NAROTHAM REDDY,  
22-6-1957.

5. A. K. K. NAMBIAR,  
22-6-1957.

K. G. DESIKAN,  
*Secretary.*  
14-6-1957.

## APPENDIX. No. I.

### *List of witnesses Examined by the Committee*

Sr. No.	Name.
1.	Dr. C. Ranga Rao, M.B.B.S., Private Medical Practitioner, <i>Eluru</i> .
2.	Sri. P.L. Narasimham, Godown-Keeper, Central Bank of India, <i>Eluru</i> .
3.	„ D. V. Rama Raju, Agriculturist, <i>West Godavari</i> .
4.	„ K. Subramaniam, Clerk in Mandy, <i>Eluru</i> .
5.	„ N. Prasad Rao, Photographer, <i>Bezwada</i> .
6.	„ G. Sathyanarayana, Photographer, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
7.	„ T. G. S. Suridaram, Correspondent, 'Deccan Chronicle', <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
8.	„ N. Seshacharyulu, Archaka.
9.	„ G. Subba Rao, Correspondent, 'Mail'.
10.	„ R. Krishna Moorthy, Correspondent, 'Indian Express'.
11.	„ Karnam Ramiah, Reddipalyam near <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
12.	„ Ramulu, <i>Borgampad</i> .
13.	„ P. Madhusudhana Rao, Tailor, <i>Borgampad</i> .
14.	„ Mastan Khan, <i>Borgampad</i> .
15.	„ Sanka Satyam, <i>Borgampad</i> .
16.	„ K. Janardhan Rao, Landholder, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
17.	„ P. Rama Reddi, Secretary, Taluka Congress Committee, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
18.	„ I. R. K. Sastry, 'Hindu' Correspondent.
19.	„ C. V. Rao, Excise Sub-Inspector.
20.	„ E. Floate, Junior Superintendent, P.W.D. Workshops, <i>Dhowsleshwaram</i> .
21.	„ B. Suryanarayana Moorthi, (Incharge of Sri Rama Temple at <i>Bhadrachalam</i> ), Tahsildar, <i>Borgampad</i> .
22.	„ K. Ramachander Rao, Temple Amin.
23.	„ M. Rama Rao, Tahsildar, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
24.	„ K. Kondal Rao, President, Taluka Congress Committee.
25.	Dr. S. V. V. Narasimham, Private Medical Practitioner.
26.	Sri. E. Pichi Reddi <i>Reddipalyam</i> .
27.	„ C. Seetha Rama Rao, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
28.	„ Bedelineni Ramayya, Ferry Contractor, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
29.	„ Kanasani Appa Rao, Ferry Contractor, <i>Gummur</i> .
30.	„ Talavathi Subba Rao, <i>Banjara</i>
31.	„ Boddu Peddulu, Small Boat-owner, <i>Dhowsleshwaram</i> .
32.	„ Gangala Tathiah, <i>Dhowsleshwaram</i> .

Sr.No.	Name
33.	Sri. Gorra Rama Rao, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
34.	„ B. Rama Rao, <i>Reddipalyam</i> .
35.	„ S. Konda Reddi, <i>Reddipalyam</i> .
36.	„ K. Ramiah, Khalasi in the boat at Bhadrachalam, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
37.	„ Kamal Sahab, <i>Borgampad</i> .
38.	„ Chukkapalli Ramiah, <i>Tenali Taluk</i> ,
39.	„ S. Narasimlu, Boatman.
40.	„ K. M. Appalaswami, <i>Dommugudam</i> .
41.	„ M. Erranna, Fisherman, <i>Dommugudam</i> .
42.	„ C. Venkat Rao, Anicut Superintendent, <i>Dommugudam</i> .
43.	„ Siva Subramanyam, Superintending Engineer, <i>Dhowleshwaram Circle</i> .
44.	Dr. A. Krishnaswamy, Collector, <i>East Godavari district</i> .
45.	Sri. A. Subbiah Chetty, Revenue Divisional Officer, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
46.	„ L. J. Victor, District Superintendent of Police.
47.	„ B. Veeraswamy, Circle Inspector, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
48.	„ Bhandaru Chandra Rao, Agriculturist, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
49.	„ Pundarikakshudu, Retired Head Clerk, Collector's Office, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
50.	„ B. Manickam, Police Constable No. 840, <i>Ramachandrapuram</i> .
51.	„ L. Chandrashekara Rao, District Health Officer, <i>Kakinada</i> .
52.	„ I. V. Subba Rao, Deputy Superintendent of Police, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
53.	„ C. Krishna Reddi, Sathapalli, <i>Khammam district</i> .
54.	„ Madeneni Ramiah, Boat Contractor, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
55.	„ Bhoja Raju, Assistant District Commissioner of Scouts, <i>Kothagudam Collieries</i> .
56.	„ D. Durgiah, Pro-mining Officer, <i>Kothagudam Collieries</i> .
57.	„ G. Ramakrishna, Apprentice.
58.	„ N. Narsiah, Pump Driver.
59.	„ V. Gopala Krishna Moorthy, Clerk, Dy. Collector's Office.
60.	„ Badugu Surayya, (Survivor), Mandapadu, <i>Bhimavaram taluk</i> .
61.	„ M. G. Sambiah, Assistant State Organising Commissioner of Scouts (Telangana), Bashir Bagh, <i>Hyderabad-Dn</i> .
62.	„ Nandam Subba Rao, <i>Mogallu, Bhimavaram taluk</i> .
63.	„ K. L. Hanumanth Rao, Cultivator, <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .
64.	„ Gorla Mahankali, <i>Mandapadu, Bhimavaram taluk</i> .
65.	„ Venugopal Nayagar, Advocate, <i>Madras</i> .
66.	„ Gorrela Narayana, <i>Palagudam in Eluru taluk</i> .
67.	„ T. Surayya, Kabadiguda, <i>Eluru</i> .
68.	„ Karri Channiah, <i>Bhimavaram</i> .



Sr.No.	Name
69.	Sri Giri Thammaiah, <i>Kannur</i> .
70.	„ Dharmapuri Kasturi Rangiah, Cultivator, <i>Borgampad</i> .
71.	„ Shankariah, <i>Palakole</i> .
72.	„ Adi Narayana, <i>Kannur</i> .
73.	„ Gorrela Narasimha Swamy. (Accompanied Witness No. 66).
74.	„ E. V. Padmanabhan (attended the festival). Journalist, <i>Hyderabad-Dn</i> .
75.	Smt. Marri Pollamma, (Survivor—lost her husband). <i>Eluru</i> .
76.	Sri Yera Thathiah, (accompanied witness No. 75).
77.	„ A. V. Surya Narayana Moorthi, Assistant Engineer, who prepared the topographical plan of the Godavari river at <i>Bhadrachalam</i> .

#### OFFICERS RE-EXAMINED.

- Sri Subbiah Chetty, Revenue Divisional Officer, *Bhadrachalam*.  
 Sri. I. V. Subba Rao, Deputy Superintendent of Police, *Bhadrachalam*.  
 Sri. K. Subramanyam, Superintending Engineer, *Dhowleshwaram circle*.  
 Sri. K. Ramachander Rao (came to Hyderabad but fell ill and hence could not appear before the Committee).

सत्यमेव जयते

## APPENDIX No. II.

## LIST OF DECEASED—DISTRICT-WAR.

## 1. Vizag District.

Sr. No.	Name
1.	Nukala Simbachalam w/o Appanna, aged 80 years, Kapu of Chinagommalluru of Yelamanchili Taluk.
2.	Nukala Rajeshwari, aged 5 years, d/o the above deceased.
8.	Appanna Kamaraju w/o Narasinga Rao, aged 20 years, Kapu of Rayavaram of Yelamanchili Taluk.

## 2. East Godavari District.

4. Ballari Kannayya s/o Appannareddi, 85 years, Bhadrachalam, Boatman.
5. Velagleti Subrahmanyasarma s/o Venkatacharyoulu, Goldsmith, 16 years, Bhadrachalam.

## 3. West Godavari District.

6. Arampalli Somamma of Pedamativeedi, Eluru, widow.
7. Nandam Gavaramma w/o Subba Rao, aged 30 years, Sali, Mogallu of Bhimavaram Taluk.
8. Nandam Sitamahalakshamma, aged 8 years, d/o as above No. 7.
9. Simhadri Satyavati w/o Appa Rao, aged 20 years, Kamma, Thimmayypalem near Kaikavaram.
10. Akula Sanyasi s/o Veerayya, aged 25 years, Gun Bazaar, Eluru, Madiga.
11. Maraka Nagaveerayya s/o Kotiveerayya, aged 25 years, Devangi, Pattibad, Eluru.
12. Gorla Veeravenkamma w/o Mahankali, aged 40 years, Yedva Mandapadu Village, Bhimavaram Taluk.
18. Kavuturi Sathiraju s/o Tirupatirayudu, 80 years, Kamma, Nadipalli, Tanuku Taluk.
14. Mandam Satyanarayanamurthy s/o Subba Rao, 1½ years, Padmasali, Mogallu, Bhimavaram Taluk.
15. Gandam Mangamma w/o Veeranna, Kapu, Kanur of Tanuku Taluk.
16. Tadepalli Lakshmi w/o Surayya, Harijan, 20 years, Madepalli.
17. Thota Subbulu w/o Sriramamurthy, Kapu, aged 20 years, Pedakapavaram, Bhimavaram Taluk.
18. Simhadri Sarojini w/o Venkadurangam, Kamma, 28 years, Thimmapuram, Eluru Taluk.
19. Yelamantri Chellamma w/o Narayana Rao, Kamma, aged 20 years, Thimmayypalem, Eluru, Taluk.
20. Simhadri Satyanarayana s/o Ratyya, Kamma, aged 25 years, Eluru Taluk.

Sr.No.

Name

*West Godavari District.—Contd.*

21. Giri Narasimhamurthy s/o Thammayya, Kapu, 28 years, Kanuru, Tanuku Taluk.
22. Pathuri Subbayamma d/o Brahmayya, 16 years, Nallammidada, Eluru Taluk.
23. Gurralla Bangarayya s/o Atchanna, Kapu, 16 years, Palagudem, Eluru Taluk.
24. Simhadri Venkata Subbamma w/o Satyanarayanamurthy, Thimmayyapalem, Eluru Taluk.
25. Sisapalli Appanna w/o Nallayya, Gandhinagaram, Kothapeta, Eluru Taluk.
26. Mulakala Hymavati w/o Sambamurthy, Patabazaar, Eluru.
27. Aragala Ramulu s/o Ramanna, aged 20 years, Barber, Tiranampalem, Eluru, Taluk.

*4. Krishna District.*

28. Vemuru Gopalakrishnamurthy s/o Subramanyam, aged 45 years, Brahmin, Bezwada.
29. Kollu Gopalakrishnayya s/o Ramayya, aged 35 years, Kamma, Nagayalanka, Divi Taluk.
30. Pilagala Nageswara Rao s/o Narasimhulu, Golla, 22 years, Valasapalli, Nuzvid Taluq.
31. Pilagala Rama Rao, aged 2 years, s/o above No. 30.
32. Thota Chella w/o Nagendram, aged 30 years, Kapu, Korukallu, Kaikaluru Taluk.
33. Nagamuthi Suramma w/o Subbiah, aged 40 years, Pamulapadu, Gudivada Taluk.
34. Murani Suradevi w/o Giriraju, aged 50 years, Kondara, Avanigadda Taluk.
35. Chelamalacheti Nancharamma w/o Seshagiri Rao, aged 20 years, Kapu, Korukallu Kaikaluru Taluk.
36. Parvateneni Sarswati w/o Venkata Subbiah, Kamma, aged 50 years, Venukur, Bezwada Taluk.
37. Konduri Ramakrishnayya s/o Chembayya, Kamma, Gommadadur, Nandigama Taluk.
38. Chandramma, aged 30 years, Padamatilanka, Bezwada.
39. Edey Girija, s/o Venkataswamy, aged 40 years, Gamalla, Proddutur, Hamlet of Utukur, Kaikalur Taluk.

*5. Guntur District.*

40. Sidella Rangamma w/o Subbiah, aged 35 years, Mutylammapadu, Gurujala Taluk.
41. Panam Govindamma w/o Lingareddi, aged 50 years, Dodleru, Sat-tenapalli Taluk.
42. Maram Hanumareddi s/o Perireddi, aged 35 years, Murzampadu, Gurujala Taluk.

Sr. No.

Name

*Guntur District.—Contd.*

43. Ekruti Mankayamma w/o Subbiah, aged 35 years, Kapu, Valleru, Bapatla Taluk.
44. Bodapati Nagayya s/o Veerayya, aged 45 years, Kapu, Vallaluru, Bapatla Taluk.
45. Chava Ramalingam s/o Bhadrappa, aged 35 years, Baliga, Adigoppula, Gurujala Taluk.
46. Arikatla Ponnamma aged 30 years, Widow, d/o Thurlapati Venkayya, Adigoppala, Gurujala Taluk.
47. Arikatla Pullamma w/o Yelamanda, aged 35 years, Adigoppala, Gurujala Taluk.
48. Kakula Bhudevi, w/o Chenchireddi, aged 40 years, Adigoppala.
49. Amidi Rajalakshammamma w/o Venkayya, aged 30 years, Kamma, Kothapalem, near Tenali.
50. Punnem Venkayya s/o Mallayya, aged 40 years, Kamma, Adigoppala.
51. Kotha Venkata Guruvulu s/o Venkataratnam, Dachepalli.
52. Godapati Rangamma, w/o Nagayya, Vellalur, Bapatla Taluk.
53. Ikkurti Audiseshamma d/o Somaraju Veeravenkayya, Vellaluru, Bapatla Taluk.
54. Ponnuru Lakshmidēvi w/o Lakshmayya, Vellaluru, Bapatla Taluk.
55. Maddineni Nagaratnamamma w/o Ramayya, Kamma, aged 30 years, Nujallapalli, Ongole Taluk.
56. Addanki Bapanna w/o China Veeresalingam, aged 50 years, Zangam, Nujallapalli, Ongole Taluk.
57. Gangiseti Manikyam s/o C. Nagbhushanam, Telaga, aged 40 years, Nujallapalli, Ongole Taluk.
58. Sheik Kasim Sahab s/o Khasimbi, aged, 60 years, Penipaddu, Sattenapalli Taluk, Guntur.
59. Kandimalla Sitaramayamma, d/o K. Lingayya, aged 30 years, Kamma, Vatticheruku.
60. Kottapalli Nagamma d/o Pattutu Salbabu, aged 30 years, Kamma, Vatticherukuru, Guntur District.
61. Cherukumelli Akkamma w/o Subbiah, Kamma, aged 30 years, Vatticherukuru, Guntur District.
62. Muppa Venkata Subbiah s/o Venkatappiah, Kamma, aged 35 years, Vatticherukuru, Guntur District.
63. Kathrem Sitaramamma w/o Kotireddi, Reddi, aged 40 years, Krosuru, Sattenapalli Taluk.
64. Yerramsetti Pitchamma w/o Subbiah, Telaga, aged 50 years, Anantavaram, Sattenapalli Taluk.
65. Pedkotla Venkayya, Father's name not known, aged 60 years, Pugantireddi, Sattenapalli Taluk.
66. Pedakotla Venkamma w/o Venkayya, Pugantireddi, aged 50 years, Sattenapalli Taluk.
67. Vuyuri Sitamma w/o Anjireddi, Reddi, 45 years, Karumurivarpalem, Tenali Taluk.

Sr. No.

Name

*Guntur District.—Contd.*

68. Gandhichetti Lakshmayya s/o Vecrayya, Vysya, aged 30 years, Pedgaduluru, Tenali Taluk.
69. Pasulapulli Ravamma w/o Venkayya, Vysya, 50 years, Bodduluri-varipalem, Ongole Taluk.
70. Kamajala Mangayya s/o Chandrayya, Padmasali, Kothapeta, Guntur.
71. Korrapati Raghavamma w/o Sivayya, Kamma, 50 years, Tenali.
72. Penuboyina Jaggulu s/o Ammayya, Golla, Nagaram Taluk, Guntur District.
73. Badem Bakireddi s/o Byreddi, Reddi, Murdhampadu, Gurujala Taluk.
74. Mulla Kesamma w/o Narayana, aged 38 years, Reddi, Baddimena-balapalli, Guntur District.
75. Mukka Ankamma w/o Ramaiah, Kamma, 60 years, Vatticherukuru-patapadu, Guntur District.
76. Muppa Tirupatayya s/o Butchayya, Kamma, 38 years, Vatticherukuru.
77. Vadduri Annapurnamma w/o Veerasankara Rao, Valluru, Bapatla Taluk.
78. Matta Subbamma w/o Kotayya, aged 40 years, Kapu, Vellalur, Bapatla Taluk.

*6. Nellore District.*

79. Sitala Kondayya s/o Ramanna, aged 30 years, Panugodu, Atmakur Taluk.
80. Kutचितada Ademma w/o (not known), aged 35 years, Kaddalur, Sullurpet.
81. Duvvuri Vengamma w/o Potureddi, Kapu, aged 60 years, Ekasiri, Sullurpet, Nellore District.
82. Duvvuri Balaramareddi s/o Puttareddi, Reddi, 28 years, Ekasiri.

*7. Chittoor District.*

83. Pujjala Reddi s/o Krishnamma, alias Papireddi, 50 years, Reddi, Manglam, Chittoor District.
84. Gundala Roshemma, aged 35 years, w/o Ramadoss, Tiruttani.

*8. Telangana.*

85. Kona Krishnamurthy, brother-in-law of Chatugulla Ramulu, Merchant, Kothagudem, Vysya.
86. Therla Vecrayya s/o Chandrayya, 40 years, Vysya, Kesamudram.
87. Chakka Ramulu s/o Garagayya, 15 years, Madiga, Nayanemprolu, Borgampadu.
88. Vadsemsetti Venkanna working in Kothagudem Colony, aged 40 years, Settibaliya.
89. Bellamkonda Venkayya s/o Appayya, aged 12 years, Tallagudem, Borgampadu.

Sr. No.

Name

*Telangana—Cont.*

90. Gogireddi Venkatamma w/o Kondareddi, aged 35 years, Reddi, Reddipalem.
91. Vallapureddi Subba Reddi s/o Obula Reddi, aged 20 years, Reddipalem.
92. Gogireddi Chavadamma w/o Kotireddi, aged 35 years, Reddi, Reddipalem.
93. Gunnampati Sitaravamma w/o Venkatareddi, aged 18 years, Reddi, Reddipalem.
94. Kanidari Bhagyamma w/o Jogayya, aged 80 years, Kamma, Reddipalem.
95. Kanidari Iurdhama, aged 10 years, d/o K. Bhagyamma, Reddipalem.
96. K. Anthamma, aged 10 months, child of Bhagyamma, Kamma, Reddipalem.
97. Seedapudi Subbareddi, aged 35 years, s/o Venkatanarasamma, Burgampadu.
98. Nakka Guramma w/o Musalayya, widow, 30 years, Telaga, Reddipalem.
99. Yerramreddi Subbamma w/o Venkateshwarulu, aged 20 years, Banjara, Near Morampalli.
100. Mandali Rayamallu, aged 30 years, Sali, Fitter, Ramavaram of Palwancha Taluk.
101. Gonapati Sectaravamma w/o Venkatareddi, Reddipalem.
102. Khasim Peera Saheb, Borgampadu, Kanchari by profession.
103. Panugonda Ram Rao s/o Veerayya, 25 years, Konjerla, Khammameth.
104. Yerram Rama Rao Tulasamma, d/o Nagireddi, Reddipalem, Borgampadu.
105. Ganapathi Perireddi s/o Venkatareddi, Reddi, aged 2 years, Reddipalem, Buragampadu.
106. Yelasala Narayanamma w/o Raghavulu, aged 20 years, Kappalabanda, Madhira Taluk, Khammam District.
107. Teegarla Mahalaxmi w/o Basavayya, Ammannagudem, Madhira Taluk, 40 years, Khammam District.
108. Karapuri Raghavamma w/o Narayana, 50 years, Padmasali, Devalapuram, Medak District.
109. Kumara Narasayya, aged 50 years, Kamma, Devalapuram.
110. Vallapureddi Nagamma w/o Subba Reddi, 20 years, Reddi, Reddipalem, Burgampadu Taluk.
111. Gunaka Kotamma w/o Adaiah, Kapu, aged 25 years, Battagudem, Miriyalagudem of Nalgonda.
112. Jakkireddi Kotamma w/o Ramachandrudu, Reddi, 35 years, Amudalabanjara, Burgampadu Taluk.
113. Jakkireddi Lakshmi Reddi s/o Ramachandrudu, 8 years, Reddi, Amudalabanjari.
114. Thipereddi Rajamma w/o Mallayya, Reddi, aged 50 years, Siripuram, Jangaon Taluk, Warangal District.

Sr. No.

Name

*Telangana—Cont.*

115. Daram China Pitchareddi s/o Laxmireddi, aged 85 years, Reddi, Reddipalem.
116. Daram Lakshmi d/o China Pitchireddi, aged 8 years, Reddipalem.
117. Dara Venkata Reddi s/o Lakshmi Reddi, Reddi, aged 35 years, Reddipalem, Burgampadu Taluk.
118. Peram Nagamma w/o Subba Reddi, Reddi, 15 years, Amudalabanjara, Burgampadu Taluk.
119. Chakali Sydemma w/o Kondaraju Mattigadu, Dhobi, 30 years, Janapadu, Palwancha Taluk.
120. Chakali Koti w/o Khatemgadu, Dhobi, 40 years, Janapadu, Palwancha Taluk.
121. Mallapalli Narasamma w/o Surayya, 60 years, Mallapalli, Devarakonda Taluk.
122. Muni Ramakantam s/o Latchayya, Karnam, Jamapadu, Nalgonda District.
123. Mannuri Anasuya, w/o Sudarsanareddi, 40 years, Gudepur, Nizam District.
124. Paladugu Veerayya s/o Ramayya, Kamma, 40 years, Aswapuram, Nizam State.
125. Therla Sitamma w/o Veerayya, Vysya, Kesamudram, Nizam State, aged 49 years.
126. Therla Chandrasekharam s/o Veerayya, Vysya, 25 years, Kesamudram.
127. Dangeti Lakshvamma w/o Seshayya, Baliya, 36 years, Ijdukuripeta, Gokdavaram Police Station.
128. Putti Venkateshwarlu, 40 years, wife Prakasam.
129. Kanem Kotireddi s/o Subba Reddi, 30 years, Reddipalem.
130. Yeda Narayana s/o Seshayya, Vysya, Bonakallu, Khammam District.
131. Pamidi Venkateswarlu s/o Kotayya, aged 10 years, Goldsmith, Reddipalem.
132. Mantri Papayya s/o Atchayya, aged 53 years, Padmasali, Devulapuram, Medak District.

*9. Kurnool District.*

133. Ramayanam Mangamma w/o Abbanna, 40 years, Baliga, Koyalakuntla.
134. Ramayanam Venkataramanna s/o Subbayya, aged 3 years, Baliga, Koyalakuntla.
135. Muli Peramma w/o Yellareddi, Reddi, 55 years, Baddellucherlopalli, Markapur Taluk.

Sr. No.

Name

*Kurnool—District Cont.*

136. Mula Polamma w/o Sivayya, 45 years, Reddi, Baddellucherlopalli, Markapur Taluk.

*10. Madras.*

137. Kandi Narayudu s/o Venkatayya, Reddi, Gogupalli, Karkapur, Madras.

138. P. Vanajakshamma w/o Ethirajulu Naidu, 50 years, Madras.

*11. North Arcot District.*

139. Singamsetti Mangamma w/o Mastan Khan, Kamma, 40 years, Vallur.





## APPENDIX No. III

*List of Exhibits filed before the Bhadrachalam Boat  
Tragedy Enquiry Committee*

Exhibit No.	Date	Particulars	Page No.
A- 1.	}	Photos of deceased persons taken by Sri N. Prasada Rao, Photographer, Vijaya- wada.	
A- 2.			
A- 3.			
A- 4.			
A- 5.			
A- 6.			
A- 7.			
A- 8.		(2 photos) 2 views of the big boat taken by N. Prasada Rao.	
A- 9.		2 views of the river bank showing the crowds taken by Sri N. Prasada Rao.	
A-10.		Photo of the sunken boats just before the accident taken by Excise Sub-Inspector.	
A-11.		Report of Sri Floate.	
A-11 (a)	}	Sketches of the boats prepared by Sri Floate.	
A-11 (b)			
A-12.		Sketches of the river showing the old and new ferry points prepared by Tahsildar, Borgampad.	
A-13.		Notification of sale of ferry on the Bor- gampad side—with note by the Deputy Collector, Kothagudam, and extract from the report of Assistant Director, Public Health.	
A-13. (a)		Comparative statement of the bid amounts for ferry on the Borgampad side from 1951-1952 to 1957-1958.	
A-13. (b)		List of members of the Festival Com- mittee.	
A-14.		Petition presented by Congress Mem- bers of Dommugudam.	
A-15.		Entries from 1-4-1957 to 10-4-1957 in the Log Book maintained by Anicut Superin- tendent, Dommugudam.	
A-15 (a)	28-4-1957	Extract from the Log Book signed by Anicut Superintendent and Superin- tending Engineer, Dhowleshwaram.	
A-15 (b)	28-4-1957	Extract from the rainfall register.	

Exhibit No.	Date	Particulars	Page No.
A-16.	6-4-1957	Telegram from E.E., Dhowleshwaram to Anicut Superintendent, Dommugudam.	
A-17.	26-3-1957	Order of E.E., notifying date of closure and opening of canal at Dommugudam.	
A-18.	31-3-1957	Notification in <i>Andhra Patrika</i> —Date of Sita Kalyanam with invitation and details of festival.	
A-19.		Sketch showing the Dommugudam main anicut, locks, etc.	
A-20.	28-4-1957	Copy of telegram issued to Collector by R. Satyanarayana about collection of excess fares.	
A-21.		Notification of ferry auction.	
A-22.	5-4-1957	Statement of Bolleneni Ramiah to R.D.O.	
A-23.	5-4-1957	Copy of sub-lease to Bolleneni Ramiah.	
A-24.	29-3-1957	Order of D.S.P. on bandobust arrangements fixing the number of Police staff necessary at Bhadrachalam.	
A-25.		Requisition for bandobust from Inspector.	
A-26.		Sketch of Godavari between Bhadrachalam and Borgampad.	
A-27.		Cross-section of the River.	
A-28.		Do.	
A-29.		Register.	
A-30.		Inspection Note of the two boats by the Committee.	
A-31.		Collector's order to Ferry Contractor.	
A-32.		Temple Amin's letter.	
A-33.	Series.	Certified Copies of Telegrams sent by the Anicut Superintendent, Dommugudam to Superintending Engineer, Dhowleshwaram Circle.	
A-34.		Letter of Postal Superintendent.	